

Applic. No. 10/701,836  
Amdt. dated June 11, 2007  
Reply to Office action of April 9, 2007

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
JUN 11 2007

Remarks/Arguments:

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 19-22 and 27-46 remain in the application. Claims 21, 43, 45, and 46 have been amended. Claims 21, 43, 45, and 46 have been withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1-18 and 23-26 were previously cancelled.

In the second paragraph on page 2 of the Office action, the Examiner requests cancellation of claims 21, 43, 45, and 46. Since generic claims 19, 41 and 44 are allowable (as seen from the comment provided below), dependent claims 21, 43, 45, and 46 are allowable as well. Furthermore, claims 43, 45, and 46 have been amended to delete the introduction of the long retaining teeth, as they have already been introduced in the respective independent claims. Claim 21 has been amended to reflect the fact that there are multiple short teeth in claim 19. Therefore, the Examiner is kindly requested to enter the amendment.

In the last paragraph on page 2 of the above-identified Office action, claims 19, 20, 27-29, 34-42, and 44 have been rejected

Applic. No. 10/701,836

Amdt. dated June 11, 2007

Reply to Office action of April 9, 2007

as being fully anticipated by Shiley (U.S. Patent No. 5,066,237) under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

As will be explained below, it is believed that the claims were patentable over the cited art in their original form and the claims have, therefore, not been amended to overcome the references.

Before discussing the prior art in detail, it is believed that a brief review of the invention as claimed, would be helpful.

Claims 19, 40, 41, and 44 call for, *inter alia*:

a plurality of relatively long retaining teeth overlapping the hole edge of the locating hole at the top side, the long retaining teeth being bent at least slightly outward.

On page 6 of the Office action, the Examiner alleges that "Shirley (sic) clearly teaches outwardly bent (see figure 2 below) long retaining teeth (95-97) since the teeth (95-97) the examiner refer (sic) to within the Shirley (sic) reference are outwardly bent teeth members overlapping the hole edge at a topside (80) of the support part."

Applic. No. 10/701,836  
Amtd. dated June 11, 2007  
Reply to Office action of April 9, 2007

Applicant respectfully notes that the Examiner's allegation is not accurate. More specifically, the cap tabs (95-97) of the cap (56), to which the Examiner refers, are disposed at the top of the tubular portion (54) having a slot (82) that results from the cap (56) being rolled.

Therefore, if the Examiner considers the cap tabs (95-97) to read on the long teeth of the present invention as claimed this is not accurate. This is because Shiley explicitly discloses that the cap tabs (95-97), which the Examiner reads on the short teeth of the present invention as claimed, are shorter than the fingers (66-68) (Figs. 2 and 3).

Accordingly, the cap tabs (95-97) cannot anticipate the long teeth, as recited in the claims of the instant application.

If on the other hand, the Examiner considers the tabs (95-97) along with the tubular portion (54) to read on the long teeth of the present invention as claimed, this is not accurate as well. This is because Shiley discloses that the tubular portion (54) is a continuous piece that is rolled to have only one slot (82). Therefore the tubular portion (54) is not is not a plurality of teeth as required by the claims.

Accordingly, the cap tabs (95-97) along with the tubular portion (54) do not anticipate the plurality of long teeth as recited in the claims of the instant application.

Applic. No. 10/701,836  
Amdt. dated June 11, 2007  
Reply to Office action of April 9, 2007

As seen from the above-given remarks, it is respectfully noted that the Examiner's allegation pertaining to the long retaining teeth of Shiley, is not accurate.

As seen from the above-given remarks, the reference does not show a plurality of relatively long retaining teeth overlapping the hole edge of the locating hole at the top side, the long retaining teeth being bent at least slightly outward, as recited in claim 19, 40, 41, and 44 of the instant application. Shiley does not disclose outwardly bent long teeth overlapping a hole edge at a topside thereof. This is contrary to the invention of the instant application as claimed, in which a plurality of relatively long retaining teeth overlap the hole edge of the locating hole at the top side, the long retaining teeth are bent at least slightly outward.

Even though claim 20 is believed to be allowable, the following further remarks pertain to claim 20.

Claim 20 requires that the long retaining teeth are angled outward at their ends. If the Examiner considers the cap tabs (95-97) to read on the long teeth being slightly bent outwardly, there is no feature that anticipates teeth that are

Applic. No. 10/701,836  
Amtd. dated June 11, 2007  
Reply to Office action of April 9, 2007

angled outward at their respective ends, as required in claim 20 of the instant application. Therefore, the Examiner is kindly requested to clarify the rejection of claim 20.

In the first paragraph on page 5 of the Office action, claims 30-33 have been rejected as being obvious over Shiley (U.S. Patent No. 5,066,237) in view of Mosquera (U.S. Patent No. 5,509,814) under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Mosquera does not make up for the deficiencies of Shiley. Since claim 19 is believed to be allowable, dependent claims 30-33 are believed to be allowable as well.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claims 19, 40, 41, or 44. Claims 19, 40, 41 and 44 are, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art and since all of the dependent claims are ultimately dependent on claims 19, 41, 44, they are believed to be patentable as well.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 19-22 and 27-46 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel respectfully requests a telephone


Applic. No. 10/701,836  
Amtd. dated June 11, 2007  
Reply to Office action of April 9, 2007

call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel respectfully requests a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition for extension is herewith made.

Please charge any other fees which might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner Greenberg Steiner LLP, No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,  
  
Alfred K. Dassler  
52,794  
For Applicant(s)

AKD:cgm

June 11, 2007

Lerner Greenberg Steiner LLP  
Post Office Box 2480  
Mollywood, FL 33022-2480  
Tel: (954) 925-1100  
Fax: (954) 925-1101